DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 438 860 JC 000 192

AUTHOR	Nussbaum, Thomas J.
TITLE	The State of the California Community Colleges, 1999.
INSTITUTION	California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE	1999-09-30
NOTE	12p.; Presented at 1999 Fall Leadership Conference, September 30, 1999. For the 1998 speech, see ED 432 324.
PUB TYPE	Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Persistence; *Access to Education; *Accountability; Basic Skills; *Community Colleges; *Educational Finance; *Educational Technology; Financial Needs; Job Skills; Partnerships in Education; Statewide Planning; *Student Financial Aid; Transfer Rates (College); Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*California Community Colleges

ABSTRACT

This speech by Chancellor Thomas J. Nussbaum deals with the state of California Community Colleges. The document begins by noting successes in three main areas: restoring access, improving funding per student, and improving the performance of California's community colleges. Between fall 1995 and fall 1999, California's community colleges increased enrollment by over 180,000 students, and per student funding has increased by $846, bringing the per student spending cost to $4,379. Despite some welcome progress, there are many other areas that need more support. During the 1990's, the colleges were not funded for cost of living changes for 4 out of the 10 years, resulting in a neglected human resources infrastructure and neglect in the promotion of diversity. In addition, a preoccupation with means, such as funding and political control, interfered with a focus on ends, namely student learning. Chancellor Nussbaum concludes with six challenges and initiatives for the system's future: (1) continue to pursue goals of access and student funding; (2) continue to pursue funding for and implementation of the Partnership for Excellence; (3) rebuild the diversity of human resources; (4) improve governance, infuse technology into the colleges, improve transfer to four-year institutions, and establish a marketing campaign--all in an effort to reach access and funding goals; (5) strengthen workforce preparation and economic development; and (6) prepare to rewrite or revise the New Basic Agenda. (AF)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 438 860

The State of the California Community Colleges
Fall Leadership Conference, September 30, 1999
Chancellor Thomas J. Nussbaum

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T.J. Nussbaum

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

TC020192

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The State of the California Community Colleges
Fall Leadership Conference, September 30, 1999
Chancellor Thomas J. Nussbaum

Introduction

Honorable members of the Board of Governors and local trustees; fellow chancellors, superintendents, and presidents; valued members of the Consultation Council; and dedicated staff, as we assemble tonight, just 92 days before the new Millennium, the State of the California Community Colleges is vastly improved yet fully challenged. Behind us are four great years of historic budget increases, a massive and successful effort to restore access, and the significant beginnings of system unity. But it's a mountain we climb, not a hill; and we are only part way to our goals.

As we gather tonight we are, at once, exhausted by our effort, frenzied by its pace, energized by our success, and feeling daunted by what's to come. Intuitively, we know it's time to pause -- to reflect on our previous efforts and to think about the year ahead. Tonight we take time to savor our recent successes. Tonight we look deeper into the decade of the 1990's to understand what has happened to us. Tonight we reflect on being true to one another as colleagues -- colleagues in a commitment that extends beyond the boundaries of our individual districts and the charters of our particular organizations -- in service to all of our students and the State. And, finally, tonight we identify the challenges and initiatives for the year ahead.

I. Savoring Our Recent Successes

As we begin, let us take a few minutes to savor our recent successes in three areas we all hold near and dear: restoring access, improving funding per student, and improving the performance of our colleges.

A. Restoring Access

As part of the 2005 Strategic Response, we committed to increase access to the system by over 550,000 students -- from 1,336,000 students in the fall of 1995, to 1,900,000 students in the fall of 2005. We made this commitment not only to restore a previous level of access to our system, but also to serve "Tidal Wave II" -- the baby boom echo -- of students coming to our colleges. By increasing the participation rate from 57 students out of 1000 adults to 73 out of 1000, we proposed to meet the enrollment demand and thereby play a key role in sustaining the economic and social success of the State.

Congratulations, colleagues! Because of your very strong efforts the past four years, we have increased enrollments to our colleges by over 180,000 students! That's right, this fall we're serving more than 180,000 students than we served in the fall of 1995. I'm also proud to report that this fall's enrollment is an all-time, historic high of more than 1,520,000 students.

The magnitude of this 180,000 student increase is somewhat difficult to fathom, so allow me put it into perspective. In just four years, we have added more students than the entire enrollment -- yes, the entire enrollment -- of the University of California. In fact, the enrollment we have added is more than one-half of the entire enrollment of the California State University. Further, in terms of student workload, the system has gone over the 1 million FTES level for the first time, smashing the previous high for the system. We are now serving about 127,000 more full-time equivalent students than we

did in 1995-96.

As part of this goal to bolster access, we also committed to make maximum use of our facilities by moving to year-round instruction. Again, colleagues, your efforts have been remarkable -- we have gone from an average of 271 days of instruction in 1996-97, to an average of 303 for the current year. Imagine -- the average number of days our colleges offer at least some instruction is 303 days per year. I know of no system, anywhere that can match this number.

B. Improving Funding Per Student and Overall Funding

As we charted our course for 2005, we also established a goal to bring our funding per student to within $1,500 of the national average by that year. At $3,533 per student in 1995-96, we were a full $2,500 below the national average; and, given available data, we estimated we would need to be at $6,500 per FTES in 2005 to achieve our goal.

In the past four budget cycles we have improved our revenue per FTES by $846, to the current level of $4,379 per student. While the decrease in enrollment fees and the reoccurrence of unfunded FTES have slightly dampened our progress, the four-year increase is nevertheless a record high. This historic progress has been made possible by four of the best-ever years in overall funding increases -- a $355 million augmentation in 1996-97, a $360 million augmentation in 1997-98, a $295 million augmentation in 1998-99, and a $234 million augmentation in 1999-2000. The total is a $1.25 Billion increase in our base funding over the four-year period. Never, ever, has the system done this well in any comparable period.

C. Improving the Performance of Our Colleges

With the Partnership for Excellence, first funded in 1998-99, we embarked on a major commitment to increase the performance of our colleges with respect to the critical student outcomes within our mission. We have just completed our first full year of this landmark program, and initial outcome data is promising. Currently, we have data on both the successful course completion goal and the workforce development goal; and data on the transfer goal and degrees and certificates goal will be in by the first part of next year. In terms of successful course completion, we have raised the system average from 68% in the base year, to 68.4% in 1998-99. This very significant increase of 0.4% puts us well on the way to the system goal of 70.6% for 2005. More important, the rate of successful course completion for certain of our underrepresented groups has exceeded the average rate for all students. The rate for African American students has jumped by 0.7%, while the rate for Hispanic students has increased by 0.5%.

In terms of the workforce development goal, we have data on the three subgoals for increased numbers of successful course completions in apprenticeship courses, advanced-level vocational courses, and introductory courses. In just one year, we have moved 91% of the way to the subgoal for apprenticeship courses, 54% of the way to the subgoal for advanced level courses, and 60% of the way to the subgoal for introductory courses. There is little doubt in my mind that we'll meet and surpass these system goals -- perhaps as early as next year.

II. Looking Deeper Into the Decade of the 90's

Our achievements of recent years are truly remarkable, and we have much to celebrate. However, the numbers I cite only partially tell the story. As we look deeper into our recent past-as we look at the decade of the 1990's-the future becomes much more complicated. In a very real sense, improving and sustaining the quality of what we do requires that we look beyond these numbers. This, my friends, is a more difficult conversation.

A. The Neglect of the Human Resources Infrastructure and Diversity

Looking back on the decade of the 90's, our colleges were not funded for cost-of-living changes for four of the ten years. We suffered an 11% loss of purchasing power, forcing us to eliminate, reduce, and defer many programs and activities. Much of what was eliminated or deferred had important long-term potential, but simply wasn't necessary for immediate survival. When economic conditions improved and the State provided additional funding, it didn't restore discretionary funding. Instead, new funding was earmarked and categorized -- for instance, for a new Cal WORKS program, for scheduled maintenance, for instructional equipment, for economic development, and for telecommunications and technology. Conspicuously absent were discretionary or other funds that could be used to strengthen the human resources of our colleges. Consequently, we had little ability to support and develop the very faculty and staff whose motivation and focus is so important to student success.

The decade of the 90's also produced little or no opportunity to further our progress on diversity goals. Virtually nothing new was funded. Worse, the political and legal conditions chilled not only our efforts to achieve greater levels of staff diversity and student equity, but also our efforts to achieve greater levels of tolerance and understanding within our institutions. Again, if these needs are not substantively addressed we cannot expect to be successful as a system in the long run.

Finally, for significant periods during the 90's, the system was without a significant source of discretionary revenue to enable it to fully attend to staff compensation and benefit needs, as well as assuring a strong core of full-time faculty.

In my view, this pervasive inability to attend to human resource needs has played a role in undermining the cohesion of our workforce in terms of the common ends and responsibilities that motivate and unite us as employees. The lack of programs -- programs that communicate, reinforce, and support the focus on student success; programs that promote the understanding of our comprehensive mission; programs that promote the improvement of teaching and learning; and programs that promote our commitment to diversity -- has been disruptive to the common bond we should all be feeling towards our work and our working relationships. During the 60's, 70's, and 80's, the sense of the "Community College Movement" was commonly understood and embraced by most community college employees. Today, this bond is not nearly as strong and cohesive.

Consequently, as we enter the new Millennium, all of us have been taxed to do more -- to become more productive and efficient. We've run hard and long to produce some impressive numbers. But in the process we've been largely unable -- at least as a system -- to nurture and strengthen the quality and diversity of our human resources. The absence of these programs has weakened the common bond -- a sense of common purpose -- that once more strongly unified us as individuals in carrying out our mission. As we move forward, restoring cohesion will be critical to our ultimate success.

B. Losing Our Sense of Common Purpose -- A Preoccupation with Means, Not Common Ends

But there is more. Let us continue to look deeply into the experience of the 90's. There is a related trend that also challenges our long-term success. In my view, our interactions with one another and our problem-solving efforts are ever so slowly drifting away from being focused on common ***ends***; instead, we increasingly seem to be fighting one another over our favored ***means*** to an ***end***.

Norton Grubb, in his recent book, ***Honored But Invisible-An Inside Look at Teaching in the Community Colleges***, speaks of this trend:

> "their political and managerial roles [he is speaking of administrators] often swamp their roles as educational leaders. All too often debates about education become mired in conflicts over means -- funding, political control, personnel policies, and the allocation of space and equipment. The ends, the learning of students and its facilitation by instructors, are forgotten."

In my view, all of us within the system have tended to become preoccupied with the ***means*** and not the ***ends***. Having been starved for funds for so long, the temptation for each district and organization is to attempt to dictate and control the ***means*** so that it can assure the ***ends***. For instance, our faculty colleagues believe the proper way to ensure greater levels of student success is to have a greater number of full-time faculty; and for part-time faculty to have rights, responsibilities, and compensation commensurate with that of full-time faculty. Faculty seek specific programs and legal commitments to secure these ***means***. Others can generally support the ***end*** of improving student success through the ***means*** of increasing the number of full-time faculty and improving the working conditions for part-time instructors; but they also believe the funding priority and extent of commitment must be decided at the district level. They reject the ***means*** of separate State programs and legal mandates.

All of us -- including administrative, faculty, classified and student organizations, as well as districts -- have been tempted to dictate and control specific solutions to assure general ***ends***. From these various parties we've seen proposals for equalization funding different than that proposed by the system, augmented noncredit funding, deficit reduction funding, growth funding, enrollment fee reductions, and facilities modernization funding. As we all know, when one party brings its ***means*** to Consultation and we don't embrace the particular solution, the moving party often takes this ***means*** to the Legislature. The conflict is then moved to this body, with legislators being asked to choose sides, with strong rhetoric on both sides of the issue, with the system losing stature, and with the anguished dispute distracting members from our other messages of unified advocacy. The harm, however, does not just diminish the success of system advocacy. When we examine our recent past, we will also see that our battles and fights over the ***means*** have separated us from our common goals, diverted our focus, and weakened our levels of mutual trust.

C. Uniting Behind Our Common Ends, Goals, and Values To Better Serve Our Students

As intractable as this dilemma may seem, there is a solution. We start by understanding why the trend is occurring. First, I believe the inability to attend to human resource development needs has played a role because many of the values and common ends that bind us together have not been sufficiently reinforced and supported in recent years. Vulnerable and somewhat adrift, we were also hit with a recession that forced major cutbacks -- cutbacks that had a disparate effect on the various groups. This couldn't help but have a divisive effect. Then, as we came out of the recession, we were faced with meeting a multitude of funding needs. Everyone wanted to be first in line for having long-overdue needs met. At the same time, these funding decisions became even more complicated because they were being made within the context of our newly-established participatory governance structures mandated by AB 1725. All of these pressures conspired to fragment us into institutions and organizations that increasingly pursue their particular ***means*** to address an ***end***, whether it is through Consultation or through the legislative process.

To make better decisions in the future we must have the wisdom to step away from these disputes over ***means***, to reconnect to our common goals and ***ends***, and to ***then decide and move together on the means***. The place to do this is in Consultation. The place to do this in within our districts and colleges. The basic idea is that we should treat one another as the colleagues that we are, and aspire to greater levels of collegiality within the system.

What I've just said requires explanation. Let's start by recognizing that every person in this room has an obligation to his or her district and/or his or her organization. For many of us, our continuing employment depends on how well we serve the ends of our district, our agency, or our organization. And, we also know that our district's or organization's survival and success is predicated on our serving our constituency. We can't and shouldn't change any of this, but we can add another dimension.

Each of us in this room is also part of the California Community Colleges. We are all fellow workers involved in providing community college education in this State. Each of us is interested in the success of ***every one*** of our students in ***every one*** of our colleges. Each of us shares a deep commitment to the comprehensive mission of the community colleges, and supports open access to our institutions. Each of us wants to see the workforce of our colleges reflect the diversity of our State. Each of us wants to see our students succeed regardless of color, gender, or disability. Each of us wants a college and system environment that understands and embraces diversity. Each of us wants to be treated with trust and respect. Each of us wants to see every college in our system, as well as the system itself, be successful. Each of us wants to see the system and the colleges supported with the highest possible level of funding.

Given these common bonds and common ends, we should begin to understand that we are colleagues on different levels within this system. We are colleagues with one another within our districts; we are colleagues with one another within our organizations; and we are also colleagues with one another as institutional and organizational leaders within this great system of community colleges. We exist in an environment where we have duties to fulfill on behalf of our respective districts and organizations; but as part of the system -- the larger collegium -- we have duties to one another and to the system as a whole.

Now I see your minds are turning about the concept that you might have a duty to one another and to the system as a whole. And you're right, the duty I speak of is not a legal or contractual duty; rather, it's a duty that flows from the principles of collegiality and the broader impact of the policy we're involved in developing. With actions of the Board of Governors and the Legislature, the impact is almost always systemwide -- that is, every college, all students, and most organizations will be affected. With these actions your colleagues are not simply those within your district or those within your organization; your colleagues also include the leaders of the other institutions and the other organizations that are part of the system.

The relationship of "colleague" brings with it significant responsibilities that distinguish it from a multi-lateral bargaining arrangement or a simple coalition. As colleagues, we share authority, we seek consensus, and we place a great value on resolving conflict within the collegium. We hold ourselves to a high standard of tolerance, mutual respect, and desire to resolve conflict, as is elucidated and exemplified by portions of a policy on collegial governance in the California State University:

> "Fundamental to this concept [collegiality] is the understanding that a university is a community of scholars who, out of mutual respect for the enterprise and the contributions of their colleagues, agree that shared decision-making in areas of recognized primary responsibility constitutes the means whereby a university best preserves its academic integrity and most effectively attains its educational mission."
>
> "In fostering collegial, shared governance, all members of the university must realize that conflict within the university is inevitable. The challenge is to resolve conflict or at least bring it to closure, while maintaining due regard for the prerogatives, expertise, and responsibilities of those involved."

I do believe we have a duty to one another, and I also believe it's in our own best interests that we resolve conflict within the system. As we go forward tomorrow, we should ponder two broad questions. First, as colleagues, how should we treat one another and our respective issues in Consultation? Is it enough to state our proposed ***means*** in Consultation, adding the proviso that if there is not quick consensus around this or some similar ***means*** we will go to the Legislature? If we do propose a ***means***, do we expect our colleagues to do more than simply accept or reject it? Conversely, is it enough to reject or rebut the ***means*** proposed by another colleague and then consider the discussion completed? Considering our strong common ends, and considering our commitment to collegiality, the expectation should be that we all embrace a deeper and more exhaustive effort to resolve conflict within the system.

Second, how should our respective districts and organizations evaluate the policies we develop through Consultation? Is it enough to do the assessment exclusively on the basis of whether or not the policy furthers the positions or needs of our particular district or organization? Or, do we also have an obligation to evaluate the extent to which the policy furthers the interests of all districts, all organizations, and the system as a whole? Again, considering our common ends and our commitment to collegiality, the expectation should be that we embrace policies which ***clearly serve*** the needs of all colleges and the system as a whole, and which also ***reasonably or tolerably serve*** the needs of our respective districts and organizations.

Two years ago in Sacramento, on the occasion of the first fall leadership conference, the Superintendents and Presidents -- the institutional leaders -- engaged an extensive debate on the issue of "end runs" and the expected rules of behavior. The consensus then, and the consistent practice since, is that the vast majority of you and your boards have exercised great restraint in taking your particular issues to the Legislature. You have brought your issues to the Consultation Council, you have almost always abided by the results, and you have informed me and allowed for additional dialogue when you felt it necessary to go to the Legislature. With a few limited exceptions, most CEO's and districts within the system have embraced this more collegial form of governance.

What we need now is for all other participants in Consultation -- all the administrative, student, faculty, classified, and other organizations -- to join in this same commitment. From recent discussions within the Consultation Council, the leaders of these organizations appear to be receptive to reinvesting in the Consultation process and making greater attempts to resolve conflict within the system. The willingness to so engage is conditioned on discussions being real -- with focus on problem-solving, addressing concerns, and pursuing mutual interests -- rather than exchanges of positions or simple out-of-hand rejection of recommendations. That is as it should be. It is what we should expect from one another as colleagues. And it is how we should conduct Consultation from this point on.

III. The Challenges Ahead

As we commence the academic year and venture into the new Millennium, we have an opportunity to step away from battling one another over our particular solutions, to reconnect with one another on our common goals and ends, and to bring new meaning to our relationship as colleagues. Let this be a time when we reconnect on the common end of improving student success, whether it be through improving teaching and learning, through understanding and strengthening our commitment to diversity, or through a more unified effort to secure improved levels of funding for our colleges. Let this be the year that we put the foundations in place to enable nothing less than an ongoing, intense focus on enabling our students to achieve their educational goals.

We can frame this renewed focus on student success into six challenges or initiatives:

A. We must continue to pursue system goals for restoring the level of access and increasing funding per student: Restoring a level of access and improving funding per student are absolutely essential building blocks for a renewed focus on student success. Our goals go far beyond enabling success for the chosen few; indeed, to the extent we are forced to deny access to those in need of our services, we thwart putative aspirations for student success.

In the first four budget cycles of our effort we achieved one-third of our enrollment goal and almost 30% of our funding goal. With six more cycles to go we must pick up the pace, particularly with respect to the funding goal. To be funded at $6,500 per FTES in 2005-06, we must convince the State to increase revenues per FTES by an average of $350 per year for the next six years. And, to meet our access goal, we must convince the State to fund our enrollment growth at 4% per year for the next six years.

B. We must continue to pursue full funding for the Partnership for Excellence, and we must implement the program capably and accountably: The Partnership for Excellence is a landmark reform designed to produce greater levels of student success through substantial infusions of discretionary revenue. At present we have been funded for $145 million of a $200 million request (73%); and for 2000-2001, we are proposing a $155 million augmentation to bring the total level of investment to $300 million.

The Partnership for Excellence is undoubtedly the most significant systemwide effort to meaningfully stimulate a renewed focus on student success. From colleges across the system we're hearing of new activities and programs, and renewed discussions on student success. On most campuses the program has generated a significant level of excitement and energy. At others, a level of apprehension and concern continues to persist.

In order to convince the State to make the magnitude of investment we propose, all of us within the system must be behind the program. We must, together, work constructively on any weaknesses in implementation. We all need to be able to confidently inform the Legislature and the Governor that the money is being spent on appropriate activities, that the appropriate parties are involved in deciding how the funds should be spent, and that we are accurately reporting results as they occur. If there have been mistakes or misjudgments, we will take responsibility to correct them for the future.

In addition, we must faithfully implement the requirement that calls for the Chancellor, by April 15, 2000, to recommend to the Board of Governors one or more contingent funding methods as well as the criteria that would require implementation of these options. This task calls for a thoughtful and thorough product, a product that is now being developed through Consultation.

C. We must rebuild and strengthen the quality and diversity of our human resources, including our programs for human resource development: Substantively strengthening and nurturing the quality and diversity of our staff is our future. Given our relative inability to attend to this priority during the 90's, and given that we will be hiring more than 41,000 new staff during the first decade of the new century, the time to act is now. It's time to take our focus on student success to a new level; it's time to rekindle our passion for teaching and learning; and it's time to ensure a staff that reflects and embraces the diversity of our State.

This initiative has a number of components. First, we are pursuing a major budget proposal to strengthen the quality and diversity of our faculty and staff. It includes major funding to expand the pipeline for our students who aspire to be tomorrow's community college faculty and staff. It contains funds for districts to expand recruitment, both in and out of state. It contains funds to augment the Faculty and Staff Diversity Fund, and it contains funds to augment the Faculty and Staff

Development Fund. Finally, it contains funds for "leadership development" to move forward on the fine work of the "Community College Leadership Development Initiative" -- an initiative designed to help develop and support the administrative, faculty, staff, and student leaders in our system.

Second, we are pursuing a budget proposal to provide additional discretionary funds to enable improvements in compensation and benefits for staff, to be bargained locally. The Board of Governors has left room for refinements to the current proposal, which I have committed to explore and attempt to develop through Consultation in time for the November meeting of the Board.

Third, we have a full slate of responsibilities to carry out as a result of the Community College Commitment and the accompanying Action Plan, including more technical assistance to districts, better training for screening committees, and better recruitment and outreach.

Fourth, we will continue work on other policy issues related to part-time faculty. We will cooperate with CPEC in its study of part-time employment, and we will undertake other surveys and research necessary to compliment this work.

D. In order to bring synergy to our efforts to increase access, improve funding, and improve student success, we must complete four initiatives from previous years:
1) making improvements in governance,
2) infusing technology into the colleges,
3) improving the flow of our students to the four-year institutions, and
4) establishing a systemwide public awareness and marketing campaign:

Governance Improvements: Much work has been accomplished to improve community college governance. We are completing work on a major phase of the Education Code rewrite project, and are scheduled to introduce the first piece of legislation in January, 2000. During the year, we will use the Consultation process to monitor and refine the legislation; and, we will also develop recommendations for the remaining portions of the Code pertaining to community college employment. We have reviewed the Consultation process, and a number of improvements have already been implemented. In addition, I have already spoken about participants in Consultation stepping away from fights over specific ***means***, and working together the shape the best means of pursuing on common ends. Our review of local participatory governance has led us to the conclusion that no major policy changes are necessary, but that best practices and a better understanding of the current framework should be promoted through workshops and technical assistance. Finally, we are carrying out a number of strategies to enable the Board of Governors and Chancellor to have more control over the staffing, funding, and operation of the Chancellor's Office. Also, during 1999-2000, the Board of Governors will conduct study sessions to focus on the relative allocation of Chancellor's Office resources for its various functions, including: leadership and advocacy activities, technical assistance, program administration, and compliance.

Infusing Technology into our Colleges: In the 2005 Strategic Response, we committed to develop a "Technology II Plan" for the system, thus enabling us to build out, maintain, and renew the initial connections and infrastructure. The basic purpose of this infusion of technology is to improve the quality of instruction in the colleges. As we speak, the Plan is being prepared for review in Consultation later this fall, and the final product will be used in developing the budget request for 2001-02. In the mean time, the system is seeking a $16.3 million augmentation to expand the Telecommunications and Technology Infrastructure during 2000-2001.

Improving the Flow of Our Students to Four-Year Colleges: During the upcoming year, we must put new energy into the initiative to improve the flow of our students to the four-year institutions. We have a MOU and a joint work group in place with the University of California. However, because of

factors beyond our control, we still have yet to enter into MOU's with the California State University and the Independent Colleges.

Recent transfer data from the University of California show a record number of community college applications, and a record number of community college admissions; however, the number of students actually enrolling continues to decrease slightly. In addition, we know that both the Governor and the Legislature are concerned about "low transfer institutions"; and we must respond in a way that also sheds light on an issue far more complex than it appears.

Systemwide Public Awareness and Marketing Campaign: Finally, for two years we've been attempting to launch a systemwide public awareness and marketing campaign to better inform opinion leaders and the general public not only about the range and quality of our programs, but also the critical role we play in the social and economic success of the State. A Consultation task force has been working on this effort, but progress has been hindered because of factors beyond its control. I'm pleased to report we've secured approval for a consultant to assist the task force with survey and polling data. In addition, I'm very pleased to report that our Foundation for California Community Colleges has pledged $100,000 to this initiative for the current year. At long last we're in position to move on this initiative.

E. We must strengthen the roles community colleges play in workforce preparation and economic development: Our colleges are on the cutting edge in terms of their workforce preparation and economic development programs, but our position is not secure. This past year we have met many challenges in strengthening the role our colleges play in workforce preparation and economic development. We achieved a one-year legislative reauthorization of the economic development program, and have established the framework for the longer-term reauthorization that will be enacted next year. In addition, we've begun to develop outcome data that will be collected and reported as part of program accountability. Also, we have reconstituted and reinvigorated the Executive Committee for the Economic Development Program, so that with my office, the Board of Governors, and the Consultation Council can rely on it for policy leadership on economic development and workforce preparation issues.

This year we were surprised to see the Governor's late decision to not enact implementing legislation for the federal Workforce Investment Act (WIA). Under federal law, the Governor has the option of administrative implementation, but we didn't think he would exercise it. Consequently, the implementation of WIA will fall to agencies within the executive branch -- most probably to the Employment Development Department. We'll need to shift gears quickly to ensure the system is effectively involved in this different approach to implementation.

F. We must be thinking beyond 2005 -- particularly towards rewriting or revising the New Basic Agenda -- as we also participate in the Legislature's review of all of public education: The current version of the "New Basic Agenda" was adopted in March of 1996, and we all know that much has changed since that time. In addition, the ***2005 Strategic Response*** only extends its vision to that year. During the next 12-18 months, the Board of Governors should hold study sessions and the Consultation Council should engage thinking about challenges, policies, issues, and system direction for 2005 and beyond. This activity should be carried out somewhat interactively with the Legislature's review of all of public education. Some time during 2001, the Board of Governors should adopt a new or revised Basic Agenda, a document that can guide system planning and direction for the next interval we establish.

And now, colleagues, to the part you've all been waiting for, the closing.

Conclusion

Tonight I end on a personal note. In serving as your Chancellor these past three-plus years I have never worked harder in my life. I have never been more energized by a challenge. I have never been more fulfilled. And, I have never been more stressed and forced to run on empty. What gets me through the hardest, loneliest days is my utmost belief in the importance of what we're doing, and my belief in you, my colleagues. Over the years, I've gotten to know almost every one of you, many both personally and professionally. The talent in this room, the dedication and energy that you put into your work, is incredible. Our students, our communities and the State are so fortunate to have your service.

What else I know, my friends, is that our future is not "we/they"; our future is "us." I know this because when all else is said and done, we have a common dream -- the same basic vision. Our dream is that every student who has the capacity and motivation to benefit from our programs will have access to our colleges. Our dream is that our students will succeed in their educational endeavors, and that race, ethnic background, gender, or disability status will no longer visit disproportionate results. Our dream is that the workforce of our colleges -- including administrators, faculty, and classified staff -- will reflect the adult population of the state. Our dream is that we will be funded to do our job well, at or above the national average. Our dream is that all of our staff will be compensated fairly, and that they will be supported with ample human resource development programs. Our dream is that when we walk onto our campuses, visit the system office, or enter into our boardrooms, we will hear discussions that focus on student success. Our dream is that we will treat one another as colleagues, together searching for the best ***means*** to pursue our common goals. And, finally, our dream is that when we look at the social and economic fabric of our communities and the State, we will see that we are making a defining difference in California's future as a successful multicultural democracy.

Yes, my friends, let yesterday be the last day that any of us would frame our future in terms of "we/they." Tomorrow, good colleagues, the future is ours. And tomorrow we begin to achieve our destiny of making this the best community college system on Earth.

Thank you.